



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|-------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------|
| 10/662,715 | 09/15/2003 | Gautam Dharamshi | 34874-358/2003PO0183US | 9987 |
| 64280 7590 05/11/2009 MINTZ, LEVIN, COHN, FERRIS, GLOVSKY & POPEO, P.C. ONE FINANCIAL CENTER BOSTON, MA 02111 | | | | |
| EXAMINER MCLEOD, MARSHALL M | | | | |
| ART UNIT 2457 | | PAPER NUMBER | | |
| MAIL DATE 05/11/2009 | | DELIVERY MODE PAPER | | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary**Application No.**

10/662,715

Applicant(s)

DHARAMSHI, GAUTAM

Examiner

MARSHALL MCLEOD

Art Unit

2457

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 March 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF/ICE)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This Office action has been issued in response to request for continued examination filed 03 March 2009. Claims 1-29 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. **Claims 20, 23, 24, 25-27 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Seshadri et al. (Patent No US 7,209,916 B1), hereinafter Seshadri.**
4. With respect to claim 20, Seshadri discloses a method performed at a data distribution device, (Column 6, lines 50-67; continued through to Column 7, lines 1-4), the method comprising:
- determining whether a command to modify data conveyance rules is received (Column 2, lines 34-45);
- if the command to modify has been received, sending a message to the data distribution device indicating that the data conveyance rules are to be modified including identification data for

specifying the data conveyance rules that are to be modified, the data conveyance rules pertaining to messages subsequently delivered to the data output device (Column 9, lines 65-67, continued through to Column 10, lines 1-17 and Column 1, lines 15-17; i.e. discloses that the present invention relates generally to computer systems (i.e. data output device)); determining if a message specifying a user interface corresponding to the rule template and a parameter associated with the data conveyance rules that are to be modified has been received from the data distribution device (Column 10, lines 18-36); if the message specifying the user interface has been received, generating the specified user interface (Column 10, lines 32-39); determining whether a command indicating specification of the parameter has been received via the generated user interface (Column 10, lines 50-67); if the command specifying the parameter has been received (Column 16, lines 1-3; i.e. ...mail messages being received), sending a message comprising a specification of the parameter (Column 15, lines 65-67; i.e. the rule is applied to all mail messages whoever they are addressed to which are simply specifications of the parameter) to the data distribution device for changing the data conveyance rules (Column 9, lines 65-67, continued through to Column 10, lines 1-17).

5. With respect to claims 23, 26 and 28, Seshadri discloses determining whether a message (Column 11, lines 42-45) specifying a user interface corresponding to a set of rule templates has been received (Column 10, lines 32-33); if the message has been received, generating the user interface (Column 10, lines 32-39);

determining whether a command indicating that one of the templates in the set has been selected has been received (Column 9, lines 35-36; Column 9, lines 51-53; i.e. discloses that the determination is made upon the receipt of a triggering activity such as the receipt of an email, which causes the developer to fire the prior selected template.).

if the command has been received, sending a message indicating selection of one of the templates in the set (Column 9, lines 51-53; i.e. discloses that if email messages (i.e. commands) are received then instances of a rule template should fire which can be interpreted as sending a selected rule template).

6. With respect to claim 24, Seshadri discloses wherein the rule template comprises a rule template for one of the data conveyance rules (Column 9, lines 51-53).

7. With respect to claim 25, Seshadri discloses a system for managing data conveyance between a data distribution device and a data output device (Column 6, lines 50-67; continued through to Column 7, lines 1-4) comprising: a data output device (Column 6, lines 50-64; i.e. computer) comprising: a user input device operable to receive a user command (Column 6, lines 50-64); a user display device operable to present a user command (Column 6, lines 50-64; i.e. computer); a processor operable to perform (Column 6, lines 50-64) the steps of: determining whether a command to modify data conveyance rules is received (Column 2, lines 34-45); if the command to modify has been received, sending a message to the data distribution device indicating that the data conveyance rules are to be modified including identification data for

specifying the data conveyance rules that are to be modified, the data conveyance rules pertaining to messages subsequently delivered to the data output device (Column 9, lines 65-67, continued through to Column 10, lines 1-17 and Column 1, lines 15-17; i.e. discloses that the present invention relates generally to computer systems (i.e. data output device));
determining if a message specifying a user interface corresponding to the rule template and a parameter associated with the data conveyance rules that are to be modified has been received from the data distribution device (Column 10, lines 18-36);
if the message specifying the user interface has been received, generating the specified user interface (Column 10, lines 32-39);
determining whether a command indicating specification of the parameter has been received via the generated user interface (Column 10, lines 50-67);
if the command specifying the parameter has been received (Column 16, lines 1-3; i.e. ...mail messages being received), sending a message comprising a specification of the parameter (Column 15, lines 65-67; i.e. the rule is applied to all mail messages whoever they are addressed to which are simply specifications of the parameter) to the data distribution device for changing the data conveyance rules (Column 9, lines 65-67, continued through to Column 10, lines 1-17).

8. With respect to claim 27, Seshadri discloses a machine readable storage medium having instructions which when executed by a machine cause the machine to perform operations (Column 29, lines 48-51) of:
determining whether a command to modify data conveyance rules is received at a output device (Column 2, lines 34-45);

if the command to modify has been received, sending a message to a data distribution device indicating that the data conveyance rules are to be modified including identification data for specifying the data conveyance rules that are to be modified, the data conveyance rules pertaining to messages subsequently delivered to the data output device (Column 9, lines 65-67, continued through to Column 10, lines 1-17 and Column 1, lines 15-17; i.e. discloses that the present invention relates generally to computer systems (i.e. data output device));

determining if a message specifying a user interface corresponding to the rule template and a parameter associated with the data conveyance rules that are to be modified has been received from the data distribution device (Column 10, lines 18-36);

if the message specifying the user interface has been received, generating the specified user interface (Column 10, lines 32-39);

determining whether a command indicating specification of the parameter has been received via the generated user interface (Column 10, lines 50-67);

if the command specifying the parameter has been received (Column 16, lines 1-3; i.e. ...mail messages being received), sending a message comprising a specification of the parameter (Column 15, lines 65-67; i.e. the rule is applied to all mail messages whoever they are addressed to which are simply specifications of the parameter) to the data distribution device for changing the data conveyance rules (Column 9, lines 65-67, continued through to Column 10, lines 1-17).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claims 1, 4-5, 7-9, 11, 14-16, 19-21 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Seshadri et al. (Patent No US 7,209,916 B1), hereinafter Seshadri, in view of Serrano-Morales et al. (Pub. No US 2002/0032688 A1), hereinafter Serrano-Morales.

11. With respect to claim 1, Seshadri discloses a method performed at a data distribution device (Column 6, lines 43-49), the method comprising:
determining whether a first message indicating that data conveyance rules are to be modified has been received from a data output device, (Column 2, lines 34-45 and Column 1, lines 15-17; i.e. discloses that the present invention relates generally to computer systems (i.e. data output device)) the data conveyance rules pertaining to messages delivered to the data output device other than the first message (Column 9, lines 65-67, continued through to Column 10, lines 1-23);
if the first message to modify has been received, identifying a rule template associated with the data conveyance rules based on an identification data (Column 9, lines 65-67, continued through to Column 10, lines 1-17), the identified rule template comprising at least one parameter (Column 9, lines 60-64);
sending, from the data distribution device to the data output device, a second message specifying a user interface corresponding to the rule template and the parameter associated with the data

conveyance rules that are to be modified (Column 9, lines 65-67, continued through to Column 10, lines 1-17 and Column 10, lines 32-36; i.e. interface application (user interface corresponding to the rule));

determining whether a third message comprising a specification of the parameter has been received from the data output device in response to the third message specifying the user interface (Column 15, lines 63-67 continued through Column 16, lines 1-3; i.e. the set of data that has to be matched against the mail messages being received is simply the set which is also the parameter that must be matched (i.e. determined) for all messages received and Column 10, lines 32-36; i.e. interface application (user interface corresponding to the rule)).

Seshadri does not disclose if the third message specifying the parameter has been received, creating a rule by binding the rule template with the specified parameter.

However, Serrano-Morales discloses that if the third message specifying the parameter has been received, creating a rule by binding the rule template with the specified parameter (Page 2; [0029], lines 1-5).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Seshadri with the teachings of Serrano-Morales, in order to allow a user to implement received rules, rule changes and or instructions.

12. With respect to claim 4, 11 and 16, Seshadri discloses sending a message specifying a user interface corresponding to the set of rule templates (Column 10, lines 32-33); and determining whether a message indicating selection of one of the templates in the set has been received (Column 9, lines 35-36; Column 9, lines 51-53; i.e. discloses that the determination is made upon the receipt of a triggering activity such as the receipt of an email, which causes the developer to fire the prior selected template.).

Seshadri does not disclose identifying a set of rule templates associated with the data conveyance rules to be modified. However, Serrano-Morales discloses identifying a set of rule templates associated with the data conveyance rules to be modified (Page 1; [0009], lines 1-6).

13. With respect to claim 5, Seshadri discloses translating the rule into a rule engine format (Column 7, lines 35-42).

14. With respect to claim 7, Seshadri discloses determining whether a message comprising a subscription request has been received (Column 18; lines 34-40); if a subscription request has been received, identifying data conveyance rules associated with the subscription request (Column 19; lines 10-13); and sending data in accordance with the identified rules (Column 19, lines 52-54).

15. With respect to claim 8, Seshadri discloses wherein the identified rules are associated with a user of a data output device (Figure 18, item 1840; Column 5, lines 29-34).

16. With respect to claims 9, 14 and 19, Seshadri discloses parsing the rule to identify specifications for parameters of the template (Column 17, lines 9-12); and sending a message specifying a user interface corresponding to the associated template, the identified parameters, and the identified specifications (Column 10, lines 27-33).

Seshadri does not disclose associating one of the data conveyance rules with a rule template. However, Serrano-Morales discloses associating one of the data conveyance rules with a rule template (Page 1; [0009], lines 1-6).

17. With respect to claim 15, Seshadri discloses a machine readable storage medium having instructions which when executed by a machine cause the machine to perform operations (Column 29, lines 48-51) of:

determining whether a message sent by a data output device, (Column 2, lines 34-45 and Column 1, lines 15-17; i.e. discloses that the present invention relates generally to computer systems (i.e. data output device)) indicating that data conveyance rules are to be modified has been received at a data distribution device, the data conveyance rules pertaining to messages delivered to the data output device other than the first message (Column 9, lines 65-67, continued through to Column 10, lines 1-23);

if the message to modify has been received, identifying, by the data distribution device, a rule template associated with the data conveyance rules based on an identification data, (Column 9, lines 65-67, continued through to Column 10, lines 1-17), the identified rule template comprising at least one parameter (Column 9, lines 60-64);

generating and sending, by the distribution device to the data output device, a message specifying a user interface corresponding to the rule template and the parameter associated with the data conveyance rules that are to be modified (Column 9, lines 65-67, continued through to Column 10, lines 1-17 and Column 10, lines 32-36; i.e. interface application (user interface corresponding to the rule));

determining, by the data distribution device, whether a message comprising a specification of the parameter has been received from the data output device (Column 15, lines 63-67 continued through Column 16, lines 1-3; i.e. the set of data that has to be matched against the mail messages being received is simply the set which is also the parameter that must be matched (i.e. determined) for all messages received and Column 10, lines 32-36; i.e. interface application (user interface corresponding to the rule)).

Seshadri does not disclose if the message specifying the parameter has been received, creating, by the data distribution device, a rule by binding the rule template with the specified parameter.

However, Serrano-Morales discloses if the third message specifying the parameter has been received, creating, by the data distribution device, a rule by binding the rule template with the specified parameter (Page 2; [0029], lines 1-5).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Seshadri with the teachings of Serrano-Morales, in order to allow a user to implement received rules, rule changes and or instructions.

18. With respect to claim 18, Seshadri discloses a machine readable storage medium having instructions which when executed by a machine cause the machine to perform operations (Column 29, lines 48-51) of: determining whether a message comprising a subscription request has been received (Column 4, lines 59-62), if a subscription request has been received (Column 5, lines 25-27), identifying data conveyance rules associated with the subscription request (Column 5, lines 46-53), and sending data in accordance with the identified rules (Column 5, lines 46-56).

19. **Claims 2, 3, 10, 12, 17, 21, 22 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Seshadri, in view of Serrano-Morales and further in view of Abrari et al. (Pub. No US 2002/0120917 A1), hereinafter Abrari.**

20. With respect to claims 2 and 21, the combination of Seshadri and Serrano-Morales does not disclose wherein the user interface comprises a natural language description of a business function of a data conveyance rule created with the rule template.

However, Abrari discloses wherein the user interface comprises a natural language description of a business function of a data conveyance rule created with the rule template (Page 5, [0050], lines 1-9).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the combined teachings of Seshadri and Serrano-Morales with the teachings of Abrari, in order to define the business rules to users in plain and simple terms.

21. With respect to claims 3 and 22, the combination of Seshadri and Serrano-Morales does not disclose wherein the user interface comprises a natural language description of the parameters for the rule template.

However, Abrari discloses wherein the user interface comprises a natural language description of the parameters for the rule template (Page 5, [0050], lines 1-9).

22. With respect to claim 10, Seshadri discloses a system comprising: a data distribution device (Column 10, line 27; i.e. messaging server) comprising: memory operable to store (Column 27, line 25); and a processor (Column 6, lines 60-64; i.e. computer) operable to: determine whether a first message indicating that data conveyance rules are to be modified has been received from a data output device, (Column 2, lines 34-45 and Column 1, lines 15-17; i.e. discloses that the present invention relates generally to computer systems (i.e. data output device)) the data conveyance rules pertaining to messages delivered to the data output device other than the first message (Column 9, lines 65-67, continued through to Column 10, lines 1-23);

if the first message to modify has been received, identifying a rule template associated with the data conveyance rules based on an identification data (Column 9, lines 65-67, continued through

to Column 10, lines 1-17), the identified rule template comprising at least one parameter (Column 9, lines 60-64);

generate and send, from the data distribution device to the data output device, a second message specifying a user interface corresponding to the rule template and the parameter associated with the data conveyance rules that are to be modified (Column 9, lines 65-67, continued through to Column 10, lines 1-17 and Column 10, lines 32-36; i.e. interface application (user interface corresponding to the rule));

determine whether a third message comprising a specification of the parameter has been received from the data output device, (Column 15, lines 63-67 continued through Column 16, lines 1-3; i.e. the set of data that has to be matched against the mail messages being received is simply the set which is also the parameter that must be matched (i.e. determined) for all messages received and Column 10, lines 32-36; i.e. interface application (user interface corresponding to the rule)).

Seshadri does not disclose a repository comprising data conveyance rules and rule templates associated with the data conveyance rules and if the message has been received; creating a rule by binding the rule template with the specified parameter.

However, Serrano-Morales discloses a repository comprising data conveyance rules and rule templates associated with the data conveyance rules (Page 2; [0024], lines 11-14; [0025], lines 1-8; Figure 1A, item 108) and that if the message has been received, creating a rule by binding the rule template with the specified parameter (Page 2; [0029], lines 1-5).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Seshadri with the teachings of Serrano-Morales, in order to allow a user to implement received rules, rule changes and or instructions, quickly by implementing them from a rule database.

The combination of Seshadri and Serrano-Morales does not disclose a rule editor for modifying the data conveyance rules and the rule templates. However, Abrari discloses a rule editor for modifying the data conveyance rules and the rule templates (Page 4; [0047], lines 1-2; Figure 1, item 182).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the combined teachings of Seshadri and Serrano-Morales with the teachings of Abrari, in order to speed the implementation of new rules by allowing a user to create rules and make rule changes.

23. With respect to claim 12, it is rejected for the same reasons as claim 10 above. In addition Abrari discloses wherein: the memory is further operable to store a rule translator (Page 3; [0038], lines 1-10; i.e. discloses a business intelligence server that manages rule components, such as a rule translator; all servers include memory for storing data, as clearly disclosed by Abrari); and the processor is further operable to translate the rule into a rule engine format (Page 3; [0038], lines 3-10).

24. With respect to claim 17, Seshadri discloses a machine readable storage medium having instructions which when executed by a machine cause the machine to perform operations (Column 29, lines 48-51).

Neither Seshadri, nor Serrano-Morales discloses translating the rule into a rule engine format.

However, Abrari discloses translating the rule into a rule engine format (Page 3; [0038], lines 3-10).

25. With respect to claim 29, Seshadri discloses a system comprising: a data output device; and a data distribution device (Column 6, lines 64-67; continued through to Column 7, lines 1-4; i.e. platform server reads on data output device and data distribution device) the data output operable to:

determine whether a command indicating that data conveyance rules are to be modified has been received from the data distribution device (Column 2, lines 34-45);

if the command has been received, send a message to the data distribution device indicating that data conveyance rules are to be modified (Column 9, lines 65-67, continued through to Column 10, lines 1-17 and Column 1, lines 15-17; i.e. discloses that the present invention relates generally to computer systems (i.e. data distribution device));

determine if a message specifying a user interface corresponding to a set of rule templates has been received from the data distribution device (Column 10, lines 18-36),

if the message has been received, generate the user interface (Column 10, lines 32-39),

determine whether a command indicating that one of the templates in the set has been selected has been received (Column 9, lines 35-36; Column 9, lines 51-53; i.e. discloses that the determination is made upon the receipt of a triggering activity such as the receipt of an email, which causes the developer to fire the prior selected template.),

if the command has been received, send a message to the data distribution device indicating selection of one of the templates in the set (Column 10, lines 32-33),

determine if a message specifying a user interface corresponding to the selected rule template and a parameter of the selected rule template has been received from the distribution device (Column 10, lines 18-36), if the message has been received, generate the user interface (Column 10, lines 32-39), determine whether a command indicating specification of the parameter has been received (Column 15, lines 63-67 continued through Column 16, lines 1-3; i.e. the set of data that has to be matched against the mail messages being received is simply the set which is also the parameter that must be matched (i.e. determined) for all messages received), and

if the command has been received (Column 16, lines 1-3; i.e. ...mail messages being received), send a message comprising a specification of the parameter to the data distribution device

(Column 15, lines 65-67; i.e. the rule is applied to all mail messages whoever they are addressed to which are simply specifications of the parameter); and a data distribution device operable to:

determine whether the message indicating that data conveyance rules are to be modified has been received from a data output device, (Column 2, lines 34-45 and Column 1, lines 15-17; i.e.

discloses that the present invention relates generally to computer systems (i.e. data output device)) the data conveyance rules pertaining to messages delivered to the data output device

other than the first message (Column 9, lines 65-67, continued through to Column 10, lines 1-

23), if the message to modify has been received (Column 9, lines 65-67, continued through to Column 10, lines 1-17), send the message specifying a user interface corresponding to a set of rule templates to the data output device (Column 10, lines 32-33), determine whether the message indicating selection of one of the templates in the set has been received from the data output device (Column 9, lines 35-36; Column 9, lines 51-53; i.e. discloses that the determination is made upon the receipt of a triggering activity such as the receipt of an email, which causes the developer to fire the prior selected template.), identify a parameter for the selected template (Column 10, lines 32-33), send the message specifying a user interface corresponding to the selected rule template and a parameter of the selected rule template to the data output device (Column 10, lines 32-33), determine whether the message comprising a specification of the parameter has been received (Column 15, lines 63-67 continued through Column 16, lines 1-3; i.e. the set of data that has to be matched against the mail messages being received is simply the set which is also the parameter that must be matched (i.e. determined) for all messages received), translate the rule into a rule engine format (Column 7, lines 35-42), determine whether a message comprising a subscription request has been received from the data output device (Column 4, lines 59-62), if a subscription request has been received (Column 5, lines 25-27), identify data conveyance rules associated with the subscription request (Column 5, lines 46-53), and send data in accordance with the identified rules to the data output device (Column 5, lines 46-56).

Seshadri does not disclose if the message has been received, identify a set of rule templates associated with the data conveyance rules to be modified, if the message has been received, create a rule by binding the rule template with the specified parameter.

However, Serrano-Morales discloses if the message has been received, identify a set of rule templates associated with the data conveyance rules to be modified (Page 1; [0009], lines 1-6) and if the message has been received, create a rule by binding the rule template with the specified parameter (Page 2; [0029], lines 1-5).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Seshadri with the teachings of Serrano-Morales, in order to allow a user to implement received rules, rule changes and or instructions.

The combination of Seshadri and Serrano-Morales does not disclose the user interface comprising natural language descriptions of business functions of data conveyance rules created with the templates, the user interface comprising a natural language description of the parameter.

However Abrari discloses the user interface comprising natural language descriptions of business functions of data conveyance rules created with the templates (Page 5, [0050], lines 1-9), the user interface comprising a natural language description of the parameter (Page 5, [0050], lines 1-9; i.e. once a natural language interface is created it obvious to make the parameters to the interface natural language as well).

26. **Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Seshadri, in view of Serrano-Morales and further in view of Carlson et al. (Pub. No US 2003/0046282 A1), hereinafter Carlson.**

27. With respect to claim 6, the combination of Seshadri and Serrano-Morales does not disclose wherein the rule engine format comprises Jrules.

However, Carlson discloses wherein the rule engine format comprises Jrules (Page 12; [0110], lines 9-11).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the combined teachings of Seshadri and Serrano-Morales with the teachings of Carlson in order to dynamically define and modify mapping rules to customize the mapping process.

28. **Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Seshadri, in view of Abrari.**

29. With respect to claim 13, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 10 above. In Addition Seshadri discloses the processor is further operable to: determine whether a message comprising a subscription request has been received (Column 4, lines 59-62), if a subscription request has been received (Column 5, lines 25-27), identify data conveyance rules associated with the subscription request (Column 5, lines 46-53), and send data in accordance with the identified rules (Column 5, lines 46-56).

Seshadri does not disclose wherein: the memory is further operable to store a rule engine. However Abrari discloses wherein: the memory is further operable to store a rule engine (Page 3; [0038], lines 1-10; i.e. discloses a business intelligence server that manages rule components, such as a rule translator; all servers include memory for storing data, as clearly disclosed by Abrari).

Response to Arguments

30. Applicant's arguments filed 03 March 2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

31. With respect to applicant's arguments on the second page of the instant argument's. Applicant's contend that Seshadri fails to disclose communications between a data distribution device and a data output device. "In particular, the passage cited in the Office Action, namely col. 10, lines 19-23, describes that FIG. 6 describes a modification of the example of FIG. 5, not that data conveyance rules are to be modified. Moreover, the quote from this section mischaracterizes the reference in that the From Rule is not modified, but rather, that external messages are processed by rules logic as well as one or more incoming messages. As a result, Seshadri cannot be construed to disclose that a message indicating that data conveyance rules are to be modified as recited in claims 20 and 25". The examiner respectfully disagrees and refers applicant's to the rejection given above for claims 20 and 25. In addition the examiner wishes to address applicant's first contention that "Seshadri fails to disclose communications between a

data distribution device and a data output device”. The examiner respectfully states to applicant’s that Figure 19 of Seshadri shows communication over a network between a server and a client (i.e. communication between a data distribution device and a data output device (computer)). Seshadri further supports this in their specification at Column 28, lines 46-53. Next, the examiner would like to address applicant’s argument that “the passage cited in the Office Action, namely col. 10, lines 19-23, describes that FIG. 6 describes a modification of the example of FIG. 5, not that data conveyance rules are to be modified”. The examiner respectfully disagrees and states to applicant’s that “Seshadri discloses in the specification at Column 10, lines 19-23, “In this example, the From Rule example in FIG. 5 is modified to include a consideration of external data 610 that is processed by rules logic 614 and according to one or more incoming messages at 620 to perform one or more automated actions 630.” Seshadri clearly states that the From Rule is modified and that it **includes** a consideration of external data. Seshadri does not state at Column 10, lines 19-23 that the “. . . that external messages are processed by rules logic as well as one or more incoming messages.” as stated by applicant’s.

32. With respect to applicant’s arguments at the bottom of the second page of the instant arguments, that “Seshdri also fails to disclose that a rule template can be identified that is associated with the data conveyance rules based on identification data as recited in the claims.” The examiner respectfully disagrees and states to applicant’s that their claim does not state that “that a rule template can be identified that is associated with the data conveyance rules based on identification data”, it simply states “. . . the data conveyance rules are to be modified

including identification data for specifying the data conveyance rules that are to be modified . . .". The examiner interprets applicant's claim that ". . . **data conveyance rules are to be modified including identification data** . . ." as the included identification data in the rule is also modified. However, even if the examiner construes the claim as applicant's may have intended the claim, Seshadri discloses at Column 9, lines 65-67 to Column 10, lines 1-17, that ". . . user RobertB1 enters a new InBox rule corresponding to an existing rule template at 514. Sometime afterward, an e-mail arrives from PravSe to RobertB1, PhilGa, and Ehans at 520. As it is received by an Exchange server, for example, the e-mail is written into the associated database tables". The examiner interprets this as the rule template (i.e. InBox rule) can be identified that is associated with the data conveyance rules (T-SQL rule template) based on identification data (i.e. the owner/creator and sender of the email, in this case PravSe).

33. With respect to applicant's arguments at the top of the third page of the instant arguments, that "Seshdari fails to disclose sending a message specifying a user interface that corresponds to the rule template and a parameter associated with the data conveyance rules to be modified." The examiner respectfully disagrees and states to applicant's that Seshadri discloses at Column 11, lines 42-45, the rule template and a parameter associated with the data conveyance rules to be modified. Further, Seshadri discloses at Column 4, lines 10-15, which the examiner interprets as sending a message to the user that they have an email which specifies to the user, to use the appropriate email user interface that corresponds to the rule template and parameter as disclosed later at Column 9, lines 65-67 and continued through to Column 10, lines 1-3.

34. With respect to applicant's arguments in the middle of the third page of the instant arguments, that "Seshdari also fails to disclose a subsequent message that specifies the parameter is received". The examiner respectfully disagrees and states to applicant's that Seshdari discloses at Column 8, lines 6-8, that "rule processing in 410 can be extended to depend on external data from a received message".

35. With respect to applicant's arguments on page 5 and page 6 of the instant arguments. The examiner directs applicant's to the answers directly above which addresses applicant's earlier contentions which are repeated on pages 5 and 6 of the instant arguments.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MARSHALL MCLEOD whose telephone number is (571)270-3808. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday 6:30 a.m-4:00 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on (571) 272-4001. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Ramy M Osman/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2457

Marshall McLeod
Art Unit 2457
5/7/2009